UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,863	04/15/2004	Christian Riedl	P04,0099	7106
26574 SCHIFF HARD	7590 02/18/200 DIN, LLP	EXAMINER		
PATENT DEPA	ARTMENT	VO, QUANG N		
6600 SEARS T CHICAGO, IL	=		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/824,863	RIEDL, CHRISTIAN		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Quang N. Vo	2625		

	Quality N. VO	2023	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor	,	TE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	ter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for
appeal; and/or	arragnanding number of finally rei	antad alaima	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reju	ected claims.	
_	21 Can attached Nation of Nan Ca	maliant Amandment (DTOL 224)
<u> </u>		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timaly filed emendmen	at acanading the
non-allowable claim(s).	owable ii submitted in a separate,	umery med amendmer	it canceling the
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>33-36,41-56 and 61-63</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>37-40 and 57-60</u> .			
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8.	bafara or on the data of filing a N	otics of Appeal will no	t ha antarad
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	I sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		-	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/David K Moore/	/Quang N Vo/		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625	Examiner, Art Unit 2625		
•			

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 33 and 52, claims 33 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the limitation "mechanically fixing an uppermost page of the first job by a continuous downward pressure onto a top surface of uppermost page of the first job after the offset stacking of the pages of the pages of the first job and during the offset stacking of all of the pages of the second job." is not defined in the specification. Applicant explains on pages 9 and 10 how the related specification supporting the claim limitations. However, this argument is not persuasive because some of the applicant's explaination are not in the specification and it is considered new subject matters, for example: "the eccentric roller 22 at the right side is 180° offset from the eccentric roller 22 at the left side" is not defined in the specification.

Regarding claims 33 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection, applicant argues that there would be no teaching of Applicant's claim 33 of downward pressure onto a top surface of the uppermost page of the first job after the offset stacking of the pages of the first job and during the offset staking of all pages of the second job.

In response: Williams differs from claim 33 in that he does not explicitly disclose mechanically fixing an uppermost page of the first job by a continuous downward pressure onto a top surface of uppermost page of the first job after the offset stacking of the pages of the first job and during the offset stacking of all of the pages of the second job.

Borostyan discloses disclose mechanically fixing an uppermost page of the first job by a continuous downward pressure onto a top surface of uppermost page of the first job after the offset stacking of the pages of the second job (e.g., arms 124 and 126 move in the direction of arrow 164, while remaining parallel to one another without applying a lateral force, i.e. a force parallel to arrow 164 on the sets of copy sheets (Note: examiner interprets a force applying on the sets of copy sheets are plural bundle of offset stacking including offset stacking of the pages of the first job and during offset stacking of all pages of the second job). This insures that the integrity of the sets of copy sheets on tray 114 remain undisturbed as tray 114 moves laterally to offset successive sets of copy sheets from one another, column 8, lines 31-36).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Williams to include disclose mechanically fixing an uppermost page of the first job by a continuous downward pressure onto a top surface of uppermost page of the first job after the offset stacking of the pages of the first job and during the offset stacking of all of the pages of the second job as taught by Borostyan. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Williams by the teaching of Borostyan to secure offset paper sets for stacking.